

UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE United States Patent and Trademark Office Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS P.O. Box 1450 Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450 www.uspto.gov

CONFIRMATION NO. ATTORNEY DOCKET NO. FILING DATE FIRST NAMED INVENTOR APPLICATION NO. 4532670/19300 2314 09/082,109 05/20/1998 JAMES HAWORTH EXAMINER 26386 7590 04/21/2004 DAVIS, BROWN, KOEHN, SHORS & ROBERTS, P.C. WEBMAN, EDWARD J THE FINANCIAL CENTER PAPER NUMBER ART UNIT 666 WALNUT STREET **SUITE 2500** 1617 DES MOINES, IA 50309-3993

DATE MAILED: 04/21/2004

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.



UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE Patent and Trademark Office Address: COMMISSIONER OF PATENTS AND TRADEMARKS

			STATES OF ME	Washington, D.C. 20	0231
	APPLICATION NUMBER	FILING DATE	FIRST NAME	DAPPLICANT	ATTY, DOCKET NO.
	09/0821	09			
	011002(1)				EXAMINER
				Г	ART UNIT PAPER NUMBER
				L	3/19/09
				_	,
					DATE MAILED:
	This is a communication COMMISSIONER OF PA		charge of your application.		
			OFFICE ACTION S	SUMMARY	
·	Responsive to communication(s) filed on $\frac{l^2/l F/o 3}{}$				
ᅜ		inication(s) filed on	1	1-2	•
	This action is FINAL.	to to condition for a	Have an avoid for formal m	ottoro proggation as t	o the morite is closed in
Ш	Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is closed in accordance with the practice under <i>Ex parte Quayle</i> , 1935 D.C. 11; 453 O.G. 213.				
wh the	ichever is longer, from t	he mailing date of	this action is set to expirethis communication. Failure t l.S.C. § 133). Extensions of t	o respond within the peri	iod for response will cause
Di	sposition of Claims				
X	Claim(s)	1,3~8	111, 12,15,20 -	22_	is/are pending in the application. s/are withdrawn from consideration. is/are allowed. is/are rejected. is/are objected to. to restriction or election requirement.
	Of the above, claim(s))		i	s/are withdrawn from consideration.
닍	Claim(s)	1 > 4	11 . 2 18 1 2	7	is/are rejected
씸	Claim(s)	1/5-1	11,12,12,20 -2		is/are objected to
	Claim(s)			are subject	to restriction or election requirement.
Ar	oplication Papers		,		
See the attached Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review, PTO-948.					
	The drawing(s) filed o				the Examiner.
			on		approved disapproved.
$\overline{\Box}$	The specification is of	-			
	The oath or declaration	on is objected to by	the Examiner.		
Pr	iority under 35 U.S.C.	§ 119			
	Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d).				
☐ All ☐ Some* ☐ None of the CERTIFIED copies of the priority documents have been					
received.					
	received in Application No. (Series Code/Serial Number)				
			cation from the International E	Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a	n)).
	*Certified copies not re	ceived:			·
	Acknowledgment is made of a claim for domestic priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(e).				
Attachment(s)					
Notice of Reference Cited, PTO-892					

-- SEE OFFICE ACTION ON THE FOLLOWING PAGES--

Information Disclosure Statement(s), PTO-1449, Paper No(s).

■ Notice of Draftperson's Patent Drawing Review, PTO-948

Notice of Informal Patent Application, PTO-152

☐ Interview Summary, PTO-413

Application/Control Number: 09/082,109

Art Unit: 1617

The nonstatutory double patenting rejection is based on a judicially created doctrine grounded in public policy (a policy reflected in the statute) so as to prevent the unjustified or improper timewise extension of the "right to exclude" granted by a patent and to prevent possible harassment by multiple assignees. See *In re Goodman*, 11 F.3d 1046, 29 USPQ2d 2010 (Fed. Cir. 1993); *In re Longi*, 759 F.2d 887, 225 USPQ 645 (Fed. Cir. 1985); *In re Van Ornum*, 686 F.2d 937, 214 USPQ 761 (CCPA 1982); *In re Vogel*, 422 F.2d 438, 164 USPQ 619 (CCPA 1970);and, *In re Thorington*, 418 F.2d 528, 163 USPQ 644 (CCPA 1969).

A timely filed terminal disclaimer in compliance with 37 CFR 1.321(c) may be used to overcome an actual or provisional rejection based on a nonstatutory double patenting ground provided the conflicting application or patent is shown to be commonly owned with this application. See 37 CFR 1.130(b).

Effective January 1, 1994, a registered attorney or agent of record may sign a terminal disclaimer. A terminal disclaimer signed by the assignee must fully comply with 37 CFR 3.73(b).

Claims 1, 3-8, 11, 12, 15, 20-22 are rejected under the judicially created doctrine of obviousness-type double patenting as being unpatentable over claims 1-13 of U.S. Patent No. US 6450935. Although the conflicting claims are not identical, they are not patentably distinct from each other because the patented claims encompass the scope of the instant claims regarding extracts and solvents.

Claim 11 is rejected under 35 U.S.C. 112, second paragraph, as being indefinite for failing to particularly point out and distinctly claim the subject matter which applicant regards as the invention.

In claim 11 "similar" is vague; how similar?

No claims allowed.

Any inquiry concerning this communication should be directed to Edward J.

Webman at telephone number 571-272-0633.

EDWAR (J. WEBMAN PRIMARY EXAMINER GROUP 1500